

7

16
11-8-02**Hoey, Betsey**

From: delsignore@dada.it
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2002 5:57
To: Betsey.Hoey@USPTO.GOV
Subject: Patent Application N. 09/682,715

Dear Mrs. Hoey,

With reference to the Office Action dated 12 July 2002 and your email sent the 15th July, I send you here my response:

1. I accept to withdraw claims 1-4 and 16 from the application.
2. Attached I send you the rearranged and corrected claims (Apparatus claims)
3. With regard to the Divisional Application you suggested for claims 1-4, would you please give me the details on how to proceed?
4. With regard to the comment on paragraph 7 of the Office Action regarding the US patent N. 6,224,744 of Casado et al. my comment is the following:

a). The oxygen (or gas containing oxygen) is insufflated only through the cathodes. The process and apparatus is completely different: In my process the insufflated oxygen (or air) has the function to oxidize the ferrous hydroxide generated at the anode, to ferric hydroxide, whereas in the quoted patent the oxygen insufflated into the cathodes has the function to deliver oxygen to the cathodic generation of Hydrogen Peroxide (H₂O₂). (The same objection applies to the other three patents N. 4,969,981; 6,159,349 and 6,375,812 B1 of which I received a copy).

b). At the end of claims list (claims 14-19) a PROCESS is claimed: how can they be compatible with the preceding claims where an APPARATUS is claimed? Please let me know! (Maybe I could do the same?).

5. For shake of completeness I attach here also a number of claims referred to the process (Process claims).

Waiting for your response I send you my best regards,

Giovanni Del Signore

OFFICIAL